

## **Civil society and indigenous peoples' statement on Paris-Oslo process – Monday 12<sup>th</sup> April**

The Paris-Oslo process, which aims to establish an Interim REDD Partnership in Oslo on 27<sup>th</sup> May, must become more transparent and participatory, allow more time for genuine engagement with civil society and indigenous peoples' organisations and ensure that it does not undermine the UNFCCC negotiation process.

A bad REDD system is worse than no system at all for the world's climate, its forests and its people. If the Interim REDD Partnership focuses narrowly on emissions reductions and fails to take into consideration the need to establish mechanisms for implementing and monitoring the safeguards, ignoring the potential effects of REDD on human rights, biodiversity, and poverty, it sets itself up for failure and could easily do more harm than good.

### **Make Paris-Oslo process more transparent and participatory**

The process to date has lacked genuine transparency and openness with lack of participation of civil society or indigenous peoples' representatives at the table in either the first meeting in Paris on 11<sup>th</sup> March or the second meeting in Bonn on 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> April.

To be successful, the Interim REDD Partnership Agreement must be a partnership not only of developed and developing states but also of civil society and indigenous peoples. Peoples living in and near forests will be most directly affected by REDD activities. They must, therefore, have a seat at the table and adequate time to understand and comment on the proposed Interim REDD Partnership Agreement.

#### *Beyond information-sharing to genuine consultation*

Although we recognise the efforts of some countries to hold conference calls with civil society and indigenous peoples' organisations, this is far from satisfactory and amounts to information-sharing at best, rather than genuine participation or consultation which would allow these stakeholders and rightsholders to influence the outcomes of the process.

Information-sharing must be accompanied by opportunities to engage in consultation through which civil society and indigenous peoples can provide meaningful inputs throughout the process – from framing the agenda to proposing workable solutions – and where clear feedback loops for the consideration and incorporation of such inputs exist.

Forest dwellers like indigenous peoples have a right to full and effective participation, in accordance with international human rights norms and principles, and in particular a right to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) regarding decisions affecting their rights, including customary land rights. A failure to do so would be a violation of their rights.

#### *Benefits of wider participation*

Making space for meaningful consultation would greatly benefit the process. Civil society and indigenous peoples can contribute first-hand information and highlight issues before they become serious on-the-ground problems. There is compelling evidence that deforestation rates are lower and forest restoration improves where indigenous peoples and local communities have secure rights and are able to protect and manage their lands and forests. Early involvement of rightsholders will lead to a more effective (and ultimately faster) process to reduce forest loss over the long term. In contrast, a hastily developed agreement could generate more problems and unforeseen delays than solutions.

## **Extend 27<sup>th</sup> May deadline**

The imposed timeline, which aims to finalise an Interim REDD Partnership Agreement by 27<sup>th</sup> May, does not allow enough time for meaningful participation of civil society and indigenous peoples in the process. It is likely to lead to resentment, lack of support and rejection of REDD by civil society and indigenous peoples at Cancun.

The proposed timeline does not allow adequate time for addressing the many issues at stake in the process, which include, *inter alia*: the support, promotion, operationalisation and MRV of safeguards; ensuring environmental and social integrity throughout the REDD cycle and establishing a specialised international complaints and recourse mechanism. Thus, the Oslo meeting in May should rather be a stepping stone that ensures a truly transparent and participatory process for developing the needed global framework for effective forest protection.

## **Avoid a rush to disburse funding rather than addressing underlying problems**

Ambitious steps must be taken now to reduce deforestation, but we also highlight the danger of donor countries rushing to disburse funds allocated for REDD on unsuitable projects that do not address underlying problems. Rushing to channel money to REDD where the necessary governance and legislative 'readiness' is not yet secured would result in negative social and environmental outcomes overall. Difficult but much-needed policy and governance reforms are required in many countries to tackle the underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in order to develop a more sustainable forest sector on a broad scale. Unless underlying problems are addressed, so-called fast-start financing would be a false start for REDD.

## **Do not undermine UNFCCC process**

In addition, we underline that the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties remains the legitimate forum for agreement on REDD. The Paris-Oslo process must not undermine this. We are concerned with the lack of clarity on how the process would link with or report back to the UNFCCC.

### **Signed:**

ARA (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Regenwald und Artenschutz) Germany

Australian Orangutang Project

Bank Information Centre, Washington DC

Centre d'accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires Vulnérables (CAMV), DRC (Africa rep UNREDD)

Centro Alexander von Humboldt, Nicaragua

Centro de Planificación y Estudios Sociales (CEPLAES) Ecuador

Civic Response, Ghana

ClientEarth

Community Research and Development Services (CORDS), Tanzania (IPs of Africa rep UN REDD)

Dignité Pygmée - DIPY (Pygmy Dignity), DRC

Dynamique des Groupes des Peuples Autochtones (DGPA), DRC

Eco Forestry Forum, PNG

Environmental Investigation Agency

FERN

Foker LSM Papua/Papua NGOs Cooperation Forum

Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)

Friends of the Earth Norway

Friends of the Earth Sierra Leone

Friends of the Earth US  
Global Witness (Northern rep UNREDD)  
Indigenous Peoples Links (PIP Links) London  
International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) London  
Les Amis de la Terre France  
Nepenthes, Denmark  
OCEAN, DRC  
Practical Solution Nepal  
Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland  
Pro REGENWALD, Germany  
Rainforest Action Network  
Rainforest Foundation UK  
Rainforest Foundation Norway  
Reseau des Communicateurs de l'Environnement (RCEN)  
Tebtebba  
Tibet Justice Center and Tibet Third Pole  
SONIA, Italy  
Sustainability Watch Network, Central America  
The Wilderness Society, Australia  
Urgewald, Germany  
WALHI - Friends of the Earth Indonesia  
Wetlands International